UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,561	03/30/2004	Markus Aholainen	NOKM.094PA	4117

7590   07/16/2007
Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER
YUEN, KAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/813,561	AHOLAINEN, MARKUS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kan Yuen	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 March 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _30 March 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _7/1/2004_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 14, 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Monroe (Pat No.: 6130917).

In claim 1, Monroe disclosed the method of determining the protocol of a service

discovery request received from a client (see column 2, lines 26-50, and see fig. 1). As

shown in the reference, one end of the user's protocol is determined; translating the

protocol of the service discovery request into a service discovery protocol used by a

service registry, the translated service discovery request being used to discover a

service provider of the service requested (see column 2, lines 55-67, and see column 3,

lines 1-10, and see fig. 1). In the reference, both end users' protocol will be compared to

detect incompatibilities, if incompatibilities detected, then conversion begins. Here, we

can interpret that the service discovery request is the first protocol used by one end,

and the service discovery protocol can be a compatible protocol used by both ends. All

users' protocols are stored into memory for future references. Therefore we can

interpret the memory as a service registry; detecting incompatibilities between the client

and the service provider (Monroe see column 2, lines 45-55); The source and

destination data format is determined; and translating the service provided to the client

by the service provider in response to the detected incompatibilities (see column 3, lines

1-25). Finally, the system will start the conversion upon the detection of

incompatibilities.

Regarding to claim 2, Monroe also disclosed the method of translating the

protocol includes selecting one of a plurality of service discovery interfaces that are

compatible with the service registry (see column 5, lines 58-67, and fig. 3, database 16).

As shown the system selects a compatible data format from the database 16.

Regarding to claim 14, Monroe also disclosed the method of a service requestor

coupled to the service translation system and adapted to submit a service request using

a first protocol (see column 4, lines 26-50, and see fig. 1). As shown the source or the

service requestor originates a data format, which can be considered as the first

protocol; a service translation proxy coupled to the service requestor and adapted to

translate the first protocol of the service request into a second protocol (see column 2,

lines 27-37, and see column 4, lines 45-60, and see fig. 1). As shown, both end users'

protocol will be compared to detect incompatibilities, if incompatibilities detected, then

conversion begins, and since conversion can be done at either end; and a service

provider coupled to the service translation system and adapted to provide the service

requested, wherein the service translation proxy is further adapted to translate the

service provided into a format that is compatible with the service requester (see column

4, lines 45-60).

Regarding to claim 17, Monroe disclosed the method of means for receiving a

service request from a service requester; means for translating the service request from

a first protocol to a second protocol (see column 2, lines 27-37, and see column 4, lines

45-60, and see fig. 1). As shown, both end users' protocol will be compared to detect

incompatibilities, if incompatibilities detected, then conversion begins, and since

conversion can be done at either end; means for locating a service provider to provide

the service requested (see column 4, lines 26-50, and see fig. 1). As shown one end of

the service provider can be audio signal generator or video camera to provide voice or

video signal, which can be considered as the service provider; and means for

translating the service provided into a format that is compatible with capability

information associated with the service requester (see column 4, lines 45-60).

Regarding to claim 18, Monroe disclosed the method of means for receiving the

service provided using a first transport protocol (see column 4, lines 26-50, and see fig.

1). As shown the source or the service requestor originates a data format, which can be

considered as the first protocol; and means for providing the service provided using a

second transport protocol (see column 4, lines 45-60). After the conversion, the end

users are using a compatible data format, which can be considered as the second

protocol.

Regarding to claim 19, same rejection is applied as to claim 17, because claim

17 is a method claim, and 19 is a system claim.

Regarding to claim 20, Monroe disclosed the method of locating a service

provider comprises issuing the translated service request to a service registry (see

column 5, lines 58-67, and fig. 3, database 16). As shown the system selects a

compatible data format from the database 16.

Regarding to claim 21, Monroe also disclosed the method of locating a service

provider comprises forwarding the service request to another service translation proxy

located within the network (see column 5, lines 14-55, and fig. 3). As shown, the

originator's protocol is examined to determine compatibilities, if detects incompatible,

the protocol is be transmitted to database 16 to select the appropriate protocol to

comply with an endpoint.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
    4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
            obviousness or nonobviousness.

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 3-13, 15, 16, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Monroe (Pat No.: 6130917), in view of Klaghofer et al. (Pub No.:

2003/0048855).

For claim 3, Monroe disclosed all the subject matter of the claimed invention with

the exception of the number of service discovery interfaces is programmable. Klaghofer

et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the method of the number of

service discovery interfaces is programmable (see paragraph 0021, lines 1-6). Thus, it

would have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use the method as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe. The

motivation for using the network as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe

being that it provides various programmable functions in devices to perform conversion.

Regarding to claim 4, Monroe disclosed the method of detecting the

incompatibilities comprises analyzing session descriptions (see column 4, lines 45-55).

In the reference, the system selects the proper conversion technique based on the

detection incompatibilities, which can be interpreted as analyzing session description.

However, Monroe did not disclose the method of session descriptions contained within

Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages exchanged between the client and the

service provider. Klaghofer et al. also disclosed the method of session descriptions

contained within Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages exchanged between the

client and the service provider (see paragraph 0023, lines 1-10). In the reference, the

system is using multimedia communication according to a SIP standard. Thus, it would

have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

use the method as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe. The motivation

for using the network as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe being that it

provides one standard protocol even with differently furnished coding and decoding

methods.

Regarding to claim 5, Monroe disclosed the method of the session descriptions

transmitted by the client reflects the capabilities of the client (see column 4, lines 45-55).

In the reference, the system selects the proper conversion technique based on the

detection of incompatibilities, which can be interpreted as analyzing session description.

Regarding to claim 6, Monroe disclosed the method of the capabilities of the

client include media session capabilities (see column 4, lines 27-40 and see fig. 1). The

reference supports audio signal, which is the media session.

Regarding to claim 7, Monroe disclosed the method of the session descriptions

transmitted by the service provider reflects the capabilities of the service provider (see

column 4, lines 45-55, and see fig. 1). In the reference, the system selects the proper

conversion technique based on the detection of incompatibilities.

Regarding to claim 8, Monroe disclosed the method of the capabilities of the

service provider include media session capabilities (see column 4, lines 27-40). The

reference supports audio signal, which is·the media session.

Regarding to claim 9, Monroe disclosed the method of translating the service

provided comprises translating media received from the service provider into a format

compatible with the media session capabilities of the client (see column 4, lines 27-40).

The reference originates an audio signal from the source, and since the system can

initiates conversion at the source or destination, so therefore in this case, the system

converts the destination data format to comply with the audio signal generated from the

source.

Regarding to claim 10, Monroe disclosed the method of modifying the session

descriptions received from the client to match the session descriptions received from

the service provider; and transmitting the modified session descriptions to the service

provider (see column 2, lines 27-50, and see column 4, lines 27-67). As shown in the

reference, the conversion can be done at source or destination endpoints, depending on

application requirement.

Regarding to claim 11, Monroe disclosed the method of modifying the session

descriptions received from the service provider to match the session descriptions

received from the client; and transmitting the modified session descriptions to the client

(see column 2, lines 27-50, see column 4, lines 45-55). In the reference, the system

selects the proper conversion technique based on the detection of incompatibilities,

which can be interpreted as analyzing session description. As shown in the reference,

the system can initiates conversion at the source or destination

Regarding to claim 12, Monroe disclosed the method of translating the service

provided comprises: receiving messages from the service provider using a first transport

protocol; and transmitting the messages received from the service provider to the client

using a second transport protocol (see column 2, lines 27-50). As shown, the source

originates a data format, which is the first protocol, and then conversion takes place at

the source to change the data format at the source to comply with the destination data

format, which is the second protocol.

Regarding to claim 13, Monroe disclosed the method of translating the service

provided comprises: receiving messages from the client using the second transport

protocol; and transmitting the messages received from the client to the service provider

using the first transport protocol (see column 2, lines 27-50). As shown, the source

originates a data format, which is the first protocol, and then conversion takes place at

the destination to change the data format at the destination to comply with the source

data format, which is the second protocol.

Regarding to claim 15, Monroe disclosed the method of the service translation

proxy comprises a programmable number of service discovery protocol interfaces (see

paragraph 0021, lines 1-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person or ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method as taught by Klaghofer et al.

in the network of Monroe. The motivation for using the network as taught by Klaghofer

et al. in the network of Monroe being that it provides various programmable functions in

devices to perform conversion.

Regarding to claim 16, Monroe disclosed the method of a service registry

coupled to receive the service request in the second protocol, wherein the service

request is transmitted by one of the programmable number of service discovery protocol

interfaces (see column 2, lines 55-67, and see column 3, lines 1-10). All users' protocols

are stored into memory for future references. Therefore we can interpret the memory as

a service registry.

Regarding to claim 22, Monroe disclosed the method of a plurality of home

devices adapted to exchange media content in a first format (see column 4, lines 26-50,

and see fig. 1). As shown the source or the service requestor originates a data format to

the destination endpoint, which can be considered as the first protocol, and the source

and destination can be a plurality of home devices. However, Monroe did not disclosed

the method of at least one mobile device adapted to exchange media content in a

second format and a service translation proxy coupled to the plurality of home devices

and the at least one mobile device, wherein the service translation proxy is adapted to

translate the media exchanged between the plurality of home devices and the at least

one mobile device in response to their respective capabilities. Klaghofer et al. disclosed

the method of at least one mobile device adapted to exchange media content in a

second format (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10, and paragraph 0040, lines 1-5, and see

fig. 3). In the reference, a mobile radio device produces a connection to the base station

2, and the base station 2 forward the connection to GSM gateway 3, and the GSM

gateway 3 converts the signals to IP packets and forward it to terminal device 5.

Therefore, the IP packet can be considered the second format; and a service translation

proxy coupled to the plurality of home devices and the at least one mobile device,

wherein the service translation proxy is adapted to translate the media exchanged

between the plurality of home devices and the at least one mobile device in response to

their respective capabilities (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10, and paragraph 0040, lines

1-5, and see fig. 3). In the reference, a mobile radio device produces a connection to

the base station 2, and the base station 2 forward the connection to GSM gateway 3,

and the GSM gateway 3 converts the signals to IP packets and forward it to terminal

device 5. Therefore, the IP packet can be considered the second format. Thus, it would

have been obvious to the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

use the method as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe. The motivation

for using the network as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe being that it

provides one standard protocol even with differently furnished coding and decoding

methods.

Regarding to claim 23, Klaghofer et al. disclosed the method of the service

translation proxy is coupled to the plurality of home devices and the at least one mobile

device via a proximity connection (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10, and paragraph 0040,

lines 1-5, and see fig. 3). In the reference, a mobile radio device produces a connection

to the base station 2, where the connection can be proximity connection.

Regarding to claim 24, Klaghofer et al. disclosed the method of the proximity

connection includes a Bluetooth connection (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10, and

paragraph 0040, lines 1-5, and see fig. 3). In the reference, a mobile radio device

produces a connection to the base station 2, where the connection can be wireless

connection.

Regarding to claim 25, Monroe disclosed the method evaluating differences in

media capabilities between the mobile device and the home device (see column 2, lines

27-37, and see column 4, lines 45-60, and see fig. 1). As shown, both end users'

protocol will be compared to detect incompatibilities, if incompatibilities detected, then

conversion begins, and since conversion can be done at either end; and translating

media exchanged between the mobile device and the home device in response to the

media capability differences between the mobile device and the home device (see

column 4, lines 45-60). However, Monroe did not disclose the method of establishing

the mobile device and the home device as entities of a wireless home network.

Klaghofer et al. disclosed the method of establishing the mobile device and the home

device as entities of a wireless home network (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10, and

paragraph 0040, lines 1-5, and see fig. 3). In the reference, a mobile radio device 1

communicates with control device 4, and terminal device 5 at the VoIP network. The

units 4 and 5 can be considered as home devices. Thus, it would have been obvious to

the person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method as

taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe. The motivation for using the

network as taught by Klaghofer et al. in the network of Monroe being that it provides one

standard protocol even with differently furnished coding and decoding methods.

Regarding to claim 26, Monroe disclosed the method of automatically

determining the media format capability of the mobile device using a service translation

proxy and automatically determining the media format capability of the home device

using the service translation proxy (Monroe see column 5, lines 14-35). As shown, the

data conversion is initiated automatically detect incompatibilities.

Regarding to claim 27, Klaghofer et al. disclosed the method of translating the

media format received from the home device into media format that is compatible with

the media format capability of the mobile device and translating the media format

received from the mobile device into media format that is compatible with the media

format capability of the home device (Klaghofer et al. see paragraph 0039, lines 1-10,

and paragraph 0040, lines 1-5, and see fig. 3). As shown in the drawing, the home

device unit 5 in the VoIP network transmit IP packet to the GSM gateway 3, and the

gateway will convert the IP packet to wireless connection to mobile 1.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Ishii et al. (Pat No.: 5323392), Kusunoki (Pat No.: 6128314), and

Banker et al. (Pat No.: 6426947), are show systems which considered pertinent to the

claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kan Yuen whose telephone number is 571-270-2413.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00a.m-3:00p.m EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ricky O. Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ky

RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER